DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 239 698 JC 840 075

AUTHOR Losak, John; Morris, Cathy
TITLE Impact of the Standards of Academic Progress on Student Achievement and Persistence at Miami-Dade Community College. Report Report No. 83-23.
INSTITUTION Miami-Dade Community Coll., Fla. Office of Institutional Research.
PUB DATE Jul 83
NOTE 21p.; Figures for tables prepared by Margaret Mannchen.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Statistical Data (110)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement; *Academic Persistence; *Academic Standards; Community Colleges; *Enrollment Influences; *Enrollment Trends; Grade Point Average; Minority Groups; Student Attrition; Two Year Colleges; *Two Year College Students

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted to examine patterns of persistence in student enrollments at Miami-Dade Community College (M-DCC) prior to and after the imposition of new Standards of Academic Progress in 1978. Students who enrolled for 3 of 4 consecutive semesters during a 2-year period were considered persisters, while those who enrolled for only 1 or 2 consecutive terms were considered non-persisters. Data for first-time-in-college students entering in 1976, 1978, 1979, and 1980 revealed: (1) after the implementation of the standards, Black students showed increased persistence, White students showed no change in persistence, and Hispanic students showed earlier discontinuation patterns; (2) post-standards persisters had improved grade point averages (GPA's) or similar GPA's when compared to pre-standards students; (3) part-time students, in all ethnic categories, had earlier discontinuation rates after the imposition of the standards, though GPA's for part-time persisters remained relatively stable; (4) among full-time students, a higher proportion of persisters and Black and Hispanic non-persisters had a "clear" academic status after the standards were imposed; and (5) among part-time students, a higher proportion of persisters and Black and White non-persisters had a "clear" status post-standards. Based on study findings, it was concluded that the impact of the standards was differential by ethnic category, and that because of the standards continuing students were achieving at a higher level and less talented students were discontinuing their studies. (HB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED239698

IMPACT OF THE STANDARDS OF ACADEMIC PROGRESS ON STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT AND PERSISTENCE AT MIAMI-DADE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Research Report No. 83-23

July 1983

John Losak

Cathy Morris

Figures for Tables Prepared by
Margaret Mannchen
Staff Associate

Miami-Dade Community College

OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

JC 840075

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

X Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. McCabe

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Impact of the Standards of Academic Progress
on Student Achievement and Persistence
at Miami-Dade Community College

New Standards of Academic Progress were initiated in 1978 at Miami-Dade. These new policies were carried out through a series of computer programs written to monitor student progress for the large number of credit students enrolled in a major term (over 40,000). Hypothetical studies were initially conducted to assess potential impact, and a study was published internally after the Standards were in place for two years (Implementation and Evaluation of the Standards of Academic Progress at Miami-Dade Community College. Losak, Anandam, Corson. Miami-Dade Community College, April 1981).

The purpose of this report is to provide a longer-term follow-up of the impact. Note that one of the fortuitous aspects of this study is that data on student behaviors prior to the initiation of the Standards are available. Therefore, assuming some fairly consistent patterns of student characteristics enrolling over the last six years, pre-Standards and post-Standards student groups form the basis for a reasonable comparative study. Research questions are stated and then answered briefly in the narrative as they are reflected in the tables. In each case, two years of longitudinal data were examined for each group of first-time-in-college students.

The question of retention was addressed in terms of persistence, which is a stricter criterion than is usually applied. Persistence is defined in terms of the number of consecutive major terms of enrollment for each student. Students who enrolled three of four consecutive major terms during a two year longitudinal window are grouped together and will be considered persisters (since

four major terms of enrollment are the maximum possible in two years). Examining only consecutive enrollment necessarily excludes some students. For example, students who enroll both Fall Terms but not during the first Winter Term are not included in the study. This exclusion proves to be minor, since over 90% of students were categorized into one of the consecutive enrollment categories. Students who enrolled for only one or two consecutive terms are considered non-persisters.

Question 1: What was the effect of the Standards on retention (persistence) of full-time students?

Table 1 presents data for full-time students (those who were on full-time status their first term). Data for persisters are given on the far right hand columns, while data for one or two term enrollees are given in the left hand and center columns.

Answer: Black non-Hispanics show increased persistence, white non-Hispanics show no net change in persistence, and Hispanics are showing earlier discontinuation in general.

For black non-Hispanics there has been an increase in the proportion of persisters (to 54.6%) which is now above the pre-Standards rate (53.4%). There has also been a decrease in the proportion of students who discontinue after only one term and this non-persistence rate is now lower than was true pre-Standards (17.4% vs. 16.0%). These data suggest that black non-Hispanics are in general persisting longer, and even those students who discontinue are less likely to do so after only one term.

For white non-Hispanics there has been no net change in the proportion of persisters (approximately 56%) but there has been an increase in students who discontinue after their first term (from 15.0% to 17.2%). This suggests

that white non-Hispanic students who were not persisters earlier are now discontinuing sooner than they were pre-Standards.

For Hispanics, persistence rates in each category have changed to reflect earlier discontinuation than was true pre-Standards. Persister proportions have decreased (from 72.8% to 60.3%), and non-persister rates have increased (one term persistence 8.8% vs. 13.7%; two term persistence 12.2% vs. 19.8%).

Question 2: What was the effect of the Standards on the GPA of full-time students?

GPA data are also given in Table 1 as the mean GPA for the particular year and persistence group examined.

Answer: Students who are persisters either have improved GPAs or fairly similiar GPAs compared to pre-Standard-students. The GPA improvement is evident for black non-Hispanic persisters (GPA 2.00 pre-Standards vs. 2.25 post-Standards).

Students who discontinue after two terms also show either improved or stable GPAs (improved for white non-Hispanics and black non-Hispanics).

The one term non-persisters show lower GPAs for white non-Hispanics and Hispanics. Thus while a higher proportion of students are discontinuing after one term, this higher proportion is composed of lower GPA students.

Question 3: What was the effect of the Standards on retention (persistence) of part-time students and on their GPA?

Part-time students were analyzed separately since their persistence rates were expected to be lower in general. It was also possible that the Standards would have a more severe impact on part-timers because of the diversity of their reasons for taking college courses. Data for part-timers is presented in Table 2 and configured the same as Table 1.

Answer: For all ethnic categories, persistence rates have changed to indicate earlier discontinuation than was true pre-Standards. That is, the proportion of students who persist only one or two terms has increased, while the proportion of three-or four-term persisters has decreased. These data suggest that as part-time students accumulate sufficient credits to come in contact with the Standards more are deciding that college is not for them.

GPAs for persisters are relatively stable and have increased for black non-Hispanics (from 1.91 to 2.24). GPAs for students who enrolled only one or two terms show a general improvement post-Standards. Note however that the means for the one-term-only students remain relatively low (below 2.00) indicating that the increased proportions of students discontinuing after one term is still composed of low GPA students.

Question 4: Did the final Standing Categories for persisters and non-persisters show any improvement post-Standards for full-time students?

To answer this question, students in the pre-Standards group were assigned to hypothetical SOAP categories using the same criteria as were actually applied to students under the Standards. Table 3 presents data for full-time students. For this display, the one-and two-term only students were grouped together under the heading of non-persisters and are shown in the right side of the table.

Answer: With only one exception, a higher proportion of both persisters and non-persisters were in a Clear status post-Standards (the exception is white non-Hispanic non-persisters), and a lower proportion came under the Standards in each category.

For ethnic categories where the proportion of persisters increased (black non-Hispanics) or is comparable to pre-Standards rates (white non-Hispanics), the improvement in Clear status means that post-Standards persisters are comparable in relative proportion but are having fewer academic difficulties than their pre-Standards counterparts. For Hispanics where persistence rate declines post-Standards, the improvement in Clear status suggests that while there is a relatively lower proportion of persisters, they are having fewer academic difficutlies.

For non-persisters, recall that white non-Hispanics showed lower GPAs post-Standards. That is, a greater number of low GPA students discontinued. This is reflected in the fact that the proportion on Warning increased post-Standards. Presumably a higher proportion of these low GPA students chose to discontinue when informed of their status via SOAP. For non-persisters in the other ethnic categories, the increase in the proportion in a Clear standing post-Standards suggests discontinuation by choice but not because of striking academic difficulties at that point. That is, students who discontinued post-Standards did so with improved final standing categories.

Question 5: Did the final Standing Categories for persisters and non-persisters show any improvement post-Standards for part-time students?

To answer this question data were configured similarly to those for questions 3. Table 4 presents results for part-time students.

Answer: With only one exception, a higher proportion of both persisters and non-persisters were in a Clear status post-Standards (the exeception is Hispanic non-persisters). Since data for part-timers showed a trend toward earlier discontinuation from the College, the Table 4 data indicate that

both those students who discontinue and those who remain are having fewer academic difficulties. The data imply that students did not discontinue because of academic difficulties.

Question 6: For all students combined, was there an improvement in the proportion of students from various credit pool ranges placed under the Standards due to low GPAs?

Table 5 summarizes data for all first-time-in-college students regardless of persistence pattern or consecutive term enrollment. Thus the total number examined is larger than in the previous tables and now includes students who skipped some major terms.

Answer: A slightly higher proportion of students in the 7-16 credits attempted range were placed on Warning due to low GPAs, post-Standards. Conversely, a lower proportion of students with sufficient credits for Probation or Suspension due to low GPAs were actually placed in these categories post-Standards.

Since previous data indicated that the proportion of persisters and non-persisters placed on Warning had declined post-Standards, Table 5 suggests that they still represented a slightly higher proportion of students in the credit ranges corresponding to Warning. A lower proportion of students actually were put on Probation or Suspension however, even when taking credit ranges into account.

Question 7: For all students combined, was there an improvement in the proportion of students from various credit pool ranges placed under the Standards due to non-completion of courses?

Table 6 presents a summary for all first-time-in-college students similar to Table 5. In this case the credit range pools are for credits registered.

Answer: A lower proportion of students in the 30+ credits registered range were suspended due to non-completion of courses post-Standards. This parallels the findings from Tables 3 and 4, and indicates that decreases were not simply due to changes in the credit pools.

The proportion of students with 17 to 29 credits placed on Probation due to non-completion of courses post-Standards is roughly the same as was true pre-Standards. Thus decreases seen in Tables 3 and 4 were due to decreases in Probation due to low GPA (see question 6).

Question 8: Were students more likely to drop courses rather than earn a low GPA post-Standards?

Answer: For the first post-Standards group (1978) the answer is yes. Table 6 shows that Probation for non-completion of courses increased to 31.3% of the credit pool. Thereafter, the proportion declines back to the pre-Standards rate. In general, students in the 1980 group are no more likely to be placed on the Standards for non-completion of courses than were the 1976 pre-Standards students.

Question 9: Were full-time students who were placed on Warning after their first term more likely to attain a Clear status post-Standards?

This question deals with one of the fundamental premises of the Standards. It was believed that if students were alerted early enough they would be motivated to work harder to achieve the objectives set forth by the College. The analysis is presented for full-timers only, since they have a

greater opportunity to recover academically within the four major terms examined. Table 7 presents data for both persisters and non-persisters.

Answer: For both persisters and non-persisters a greater proportion on first term Warning achieved a final Clear standing post-Standards than was true pre-Standards. For persisters, the proportions is near 50% attaining a final Clear status.

Note from Table 7 that post-Standards, approximately 70% of first-term Warning students ended up as non-persisters. Therefore, being formally placed on Warning led to non-continuation at the College. Recall, however, that overall full-time persistence did not decrease (Question 1) except for Hispanics. Thus while more post-Standards students discontinued after being formally placed on Warning, the overall persistence rate was stable. Pre-Standards students were just as likely to discontinue although those discontinuing (non-persisters) were not as likely to qualify for Warning their first term.

In summary, the impact of the Standards is differential by ethnic category. Students appear to be changing their college-going behavior based on information received through the standards. Those who continue appear to be achieving at a higher level, and less talented students are discontinuing. As noted in the introduction, this paper assumes that characteristics of incoming students have been comparable across the four years examined.

Table 1

Persistence and Mean Grade Point Average for Pre-Standards versus Post-Standards
Full-Time First-time-in-College Students

Fall Term of Entry	Total Full-Time First-Time	Persistence-Consecutive Major Terms Enrolled: Fall 1 Only			Fall 1 and Winter 1 Only			Fall 1, Winter 1, Fall 2 or Fall 1, Winter 1, Fall 2, Winter 2		
		Number	Percent	Mean GPA	Number	Percent	Mean GPA	Number	Percent	Mean GPA
White Non-Hispanic										
Pre-Standards										
1976	2,236	336	15.0	1.25	500	22.4	2.15	1,263	56.5	2.71
Post-Standards										
1978	1,992	358	18.0	1.25	450	22.6	2.17	1,045	52.5	2.70
1979	1,860	316	17.0	1.23	425	22.9	2.27	1,012	54.4	2.70
1980	1,494	257	17.2	1.14	325	21.8	2.26	840	56.2	2.69
Black Non-Hispanic										
Pre-Standards										
1976	1,164	202	17.4	0.42	240	20.6	1.29	621	53.4	2.00
Post-Standards										
1978	1,037	243	23.4	0.71	274	26.4	1.52	448	43.2	2.18
1979	871	171	19.6	0.81	189	21.7	1.60	452	51.9	2.34
1980	856	137	16.0	0.89	189	22.1	1.68	467	54.6	2.25
Hispanic										
Pre-Standards										
1976	1,715	151	8.8	1.02	209	12.2	2.06	1,249	72.8	2.63
Post-Standards										
1978	2,146	233	10.9	0.95	336	15.7	1.94	1,432	66.7	2.65
1979	2,373	313	13.2	1.39	458	19.3	2.19	1,451	61.1	2.60
1980	3,266	447	13.7	0.78	646	19.8	2.07	1,970	60.3	2.60
Total All Ethnic										
Pre-Standards										
1976	5,237	725	13.8	0.96	989	18.9	1.93	3,176	60.6	2.54
Post-Standards										
1978	5,305	858	16.2	1.02	1,082	20.4	1.94	3,003	56.6	2.61
1979	5,204	815	15.7	1.20	1,089	20.9	2.12	2,981	57.3	2.59
1980	5,719	852	14.9	0.91	1,172	20.5	2.06	3,353	58.6	2.58

Data Source: Longitudinal Master File, SAS Analysis

Table 2

Persistence and Mean Grade Point Average for Pre-Standards versus Post-Standards Part-Time First-time-in-College Students

Fall Term of Entry	Total Part-Time First-Time	Persistence-Consecutive Major Terms Enrolled: Fall 1 Only Number	Fall 1 Only Percent	Fall 1 Only Mean GPA	Fall 1 and Winter 1 Only Number	Fall 1 and Winter 1 Only Percent	Fall 1 and Winter 1 Only Mean GPA	Fall 1, Winter 1, Fall 2 or Fall 1, Winter 1, Fall 2, Wincer 2 Number	Fall 1, Winter 1, Fall 2 or Fall 1, Winter 1, Fall 2, Wincer 2 Percent	Fall 1, Winter 1, Fall 2 or Fall 1, Winter 1, Fall 2, Wincer 2 Mean GPA
White Non-Hispanic										
Pre-Standards										
1976	2,048	825	40.3	1.35	449	21.9	2.26	559	27.3	2.72
Post-Standards										
1978	1,981	859	43.4	1.52	411	20.8	2.52	505	25.5	2.84
1979	1,971	968	49.1	1.78	444	22.5	2.56	394	20.0	2.89
1980	1,640	805	49.1	1.51	335	20.4	2.35	386	23.5	2.68
Black Non-Hispanic										
Pre-Standards										
1976	830	294	35.4	1.01	206	24.8	1.37	233	28.1	1.91
Post-Standards										
1978	727	308	42.4	1.41	159	21.9	1.50	194	26.7	2.12
1979	727	325	44.7	1.35	143	19.7	1.94	174	23.9	2.23
1980	1,174	583	49.7	1.90	313	26.7	2.01	189	16.1	2.24
Hispanic										
Pre-Standards										
1976	1,488	454	30.5	1.16	253	17.0	2.09	595	40.0	2.45
Post-Standards										
1978	1,810	571	31.6	1.33	333	18.4	1.93	723	40.0	2.48
1979	1,874	675	36.0	1.32	382	20.4	2.21	615	32.8	2.41
1980	2,436	884	36.3	1.21	524	21.5	1.95	797	32.7	2.42
Total All Ethnic										
Pre-Standards										
1976	4,463	1,638	36.7	1.24	925	20.7	2.01	1,395	31.3	2.47
Post-Standards										
1978	4,587	1,771	38.6	1.44	915	20.0	2.13	1,439	31.4	2.56
1979	4,645	2,006	43.2	1.56	980	21.1	2.33	1,200	25.8	2.54
1980	5,304	2,295	43.3	1.50	1,183	22.3	2.09	1,389	26.2	2.47

Data Source: Longitudinal Master File, SAS Analysis.

Table 3

Final Standing Category for Pre-Standards versus Post-Standards, Full-Time First-time-in-College Persisters (Enrolled 3 or 4 Consecutive Major Terms) and Non-Persisters (Enrolled only 1 or 2 Consecutive Major Terms)

Fall Term of Entry	Total Full-Time First-Time	Persisters		Non-Persisters		Standing Category for Persisters (Enrolled Fall 1 Winter 1 Fall 2 or Fall 1 Winter 1 Fall 2 Winter 2)								Standing Category for Non-Persisters (Enrolled Fall 1 Only or Fall 1 Winter 1 Only)					
						Clear		Warning		Probation		Suspension		Clear		Warning		Probation		Suspension	
		Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
White Non-Hispanic																					
Pre-Standards																					
1976	2,236	1,263	56.5	836	37.4	1,128	89.3	1	0.1	12	1.0	122	9.6	582	69.6	95	11.4	133	15.9	26	3.1
Post-Standards																					
1978	1,992	1,045	52.5	808	40.6	955	91.4	0	-	10	1.0	80	7.6	527	65.2	99	12.3	144	17.8	38	4.7
1979	1,860	1,012	54.4	741	39.8	942	93.1	0	-	9	0.9	61	6.0	500	67.5	103	13.9	117	15.8	21	2.8
1980	1,494	840	56.2	582	39.0	771	91.8	0	-	5	0.6	64	7.6	391	67.2	89	15.3	92	15.8	10	1.7
Black Non-Hispanic																					
Pre-Standards																					
1976	1,164	621	53.4	442	38.0	411	66.2	0	-	3	0.5	207	33.3	200	45.2	86	19.5	134	30.3	22	5.0
Post-Standards																					
1978	1,037	448	43.2	517	49.9	348	77.7	0	-	6	1.3	94	21.0	228	44.1	110	21.3	157	30.4	22	4.2
1979	871	452	51.9	360	41.3	389	86.0	0	-	3	0.7	60	13.3	182	50.5	78	21.7	85	23.6	15	4.2
1980	856	467	54.6	326	38.1	380	81.4	1	0.2	6	1.3	80	17.1	182	55.8	52	16.0	81	24.8	11	3.4
Hispanic																					
Pre-Standards																					
1976	1,715	1,249	72.8	360	21.0	1,097	87.8	0	-	5	0.4	147	11.8	219	60.8	53	14.7	74	20.6	14	3.9
Post-Standards																					
1978	2,146	1,432	66.7	569	26.5	1,265	88.3	1	0.1	18	1.3	148	10.3	335	58.9	71	12.5	136	23.9	27	4.7
1979	2,373	1,451	61.1	771	32.5	1,300	89.6	0	-	14	1.0	137	9.4	507	65.7	108	14.0	130	16.9	26	3.4
1980	3,266	1,970	60.3	1,093	33.5	1,764	89.5	0	-	19	1.0	187	9.5	694	63.5	153	14.0	213	19.5	33	3.0
Total All Ethnic																					
Pre-Standards																					
1976	5,237	3,176	60.6	1,714	32.7	2,678	84.3	1	-	20	0.7	477	15.0	1,054	61.5	243	14.2	355	20.7	62	3.6
Post-Standards																					
1978	5,305	3,003	56.6	1,940	36.6	2,643	88.0	1	0	35	1.2	324	10.8	1,120	57.7	289	14.9	443	22.8	88	4.6
1979	5,204	2,981	57.3	1,904	36.6	2,695	90.4	0	-	26	0.9	260	8.7	1,207	63.4	295	15.5	339	17.8	63	3.3
1980	5,719	3,353	58.6	2,024	35.4	2,989	89.2	1	0	30	0.9	333	9.9	1,279	63.2	299	14.8	389	19.2	57	2.8

Data Source: Longitudinal Master File, SAS Analysis.

Table 4

Final Standing Category for Pre-Standards versus Post-Standards, Part-Time First-time-in-College Persisters (Enrolled 3 or 4 Consecutive Major Terms) and Non-Persisters (Enrolled only 1 or 2 Consecutive Major Terms)

Fall Term of Entry	Total Part-Time First-Time	Persisters		Non-Persisters		Standing Category for Persisters (Enrolled Fall 1 Winter 1 Fall 2 or Fall 1 Winter 1 Fall 2 Winter 2)								Standing Category for Non-Persisters (Enrolled Fall 1 Only or Fall 1 Winter 1 Only)					
						Clear		Warning		Probation		Suspension		Clear		Warning		Probation		Suspension	
		Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
White Non-Hispanic																			
Pre-Standards																			
1976	2,048	559	27.3	1,274	62.2	489	87.5	2	0.4	32	5.7	36	6.4	1,125	88.3	78	6.1	68	5.3	3	0.3
Post-Standards																			
1978	1,981	505	25.5	1,270	64.1	458	90.7	2	0.4	22	4.4	23	4.5	1,153	90.8	74	5.8	43	3.4	0	-
1979	1,971	394	20.0	1,412	71.6	362	91.9	4	1.0	11	2.8	17	4.3	1,302	92.2	72	5.1	37	2.6	1	0.1
1980	1,640	386	23.5	1,140	69.5	350	90.7	4	1.1	16	4.1	16	4.1	1,039	91.2	70	6.1	30	2.6	1	0.1
Black Non-Hispanic																			
Pre-Standards																			
1976	830	233	28.1	500	60.2	135	57.9	2	0.9	21	9.0	75	32.2	343	68.6	58	13.6	84	16.8	5	1.0
Post-Standards																			
1978	727	194	26.7	467	64.2	141	72.7	0	-	14	7.2	39	20.1	349	74.7	56	12.0	58	12.4	4	0.9
1979	727	174	23.9	468	64.4	138	79.3	1	0.6	11	6.3	24	13.8	373	79.7	48	10.3	44	9.4	3	0.6
1980	1,174	189	16.1	896	76.3	143	75.7	1	0.5	11	5.8	34	18.0	731	81.6	93	10.4	72	8.0	0	-
Hispanic																			
Pre-Standards																			
1976	1,488	595	40.0	707	47.5	469	78.8	10	1.7	38	6.4	78	13.1	603	85.3	67	9.5	34	4.8	3	0.4
Post-Standards																			
1978	1,810	723	39.9	904	49.9	593	82.0	5	0.7	43	6.0	82	11.3	758	83.9	95	10.5	50	5.5	1	0.1
1979	1,874	615	32.8	1,057	56.4	504	82.0	5	0.8	31	5.0	75	12.2	900	85.1	97	9.2	55	5.2	5	0.5
1980	2,436	797	32.7	1,408	57.8	644	80.8	0	-	58	7.3	95	11.9	1,138	80.8	111	7.9	156	11.1	3	0.2
Total All Ethnic																			
Pre-Standards																			
1976	4,463	1,395	31.3	2,563	57.4	1,101	78.9	14	1.0	91	6.5	189	13.6	2,146	83.7	217	8.5	189	7.4	11	0.4
Post-Standards																			
1978	4,587	1,439	31.4	2,686	58.6	1,207	83.9	7	0.5	80	5.5	145	10.1	2,301	85.7	228	8.5	152	5.6	5	0.2
1979	4,645	1,200	25.8	2,986	64.3	1,018	84.9	10	0.8	53	4.4	119	9.9	2,617	87.6	223	7.5	137	4.6	9	0.3
1980	5,304	1,389	26.2	3,478	65.6	1,153	83.0	5	0.4	86	6.2	145	10.4	2,940	84.5	274	7.9	260	7.5	4	0.1

Data Source: Longitudinal Master File, SAS Analysis.

Table 5

Students in Standing Categories due to Low Grade Point Average
Compared to Credit Range Pools for
Pre-Standards vs. Post-Standards All First-time-in-College Students

Cumultative Credits Attempted During Two Years	Fall Term of Entry	Number of Students in Credit Pool	Standing Category After Two Years					
			Warning		Probation		Suspension	
			Number	Percent of Pool	Number	Percent of Pool	Number	Percent of Pool
7 - '6	Pre-Standards:							
	1976	1,912	506	26.5	0	-	0	-
	Post-Standards:							
	1978	2,187	575	26.3	0	-	0	-
	1979	2,057	561	27.3	0	-	0	-
	1980	2,207	615	27.9	0	-	0	-
17 - 29	Pre-Standards:							
	1976	1,851	0	-	300	16.2	0	-
	Post-Standards:							
	1978	1,896	0	-	272	14.4	0	-
	1979	1,822	0	-	264	14.5	0	-
	1980	2,070	0	-	290	14.0	0	-
30+	Pre-Standards:							
	1976	3,827	0	-	0	-	231	6.0
	Post-Standards:							
	1978	3,534	0	-	0	-	114	3.2
	1979	3,590	0	-	0	-	109	3.0
	1980	3,921	0	-	0	-	114	2.9

Data Source: Longitudinal Master File SAS Analysis.

Table 6

Students in Standing Categories due to Non-Completion of Courses
Compared to Credit Range Pools For
Pre-Standards vs. Post-Standards All First-time-in-College Students

Cumulative Credits Registered During Two Years	Fall Term of Entry	Number of Students in Credit Pool	Standing Category After Two Years			
			Probation		Suspension	
			Number	Percent of Pool	Number	Percent of Pool
17 - 29	Pre-Standards:					
	1976	1,680	486	28.9	0	-
	Post-Standards:					
	1978	1,792	560	31.3	0	-
	1979	1,625	395	24.3	0	-
	1980	1,979	580	29.3	0	-
30+	Pre-Standards:					
	1976	4,856	0	-	623	12.8
	Post-Standards:					
	1978	4,625	0	-	548	11.8
	1979	4,575	0	-	450	9.8
	1980	5,077	0	-	551	10.9

Data Source: Longitudinal Master File SAS Analysis.

Table 7

Clear Standing for Pre-Standards and
Post-Standards Students Placed on Warning After Their
First Term, Full-Time First-time-in-College Students

Fall Term of Entry	Total Full-time Persisters Plus Non-Persisters	On Academic Warning After First Term		Outcomes for Warning Group							
				Persisters on Warning				Non-Persisters on Warning			
		Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Warning	Achieved Final Clear Status	Percent of Persisters	Number	Percent of Warning	Achieved Final Clear Status	Percent of Non-Persisters
Pre-Standards											
1976	4,890	699	14.3	267	38.2	89	33.3	432	61.8	16	3.7
Post-Standards											
1978	4,943	693	14.0	207	29.9	99	47.8	486	70.1	15	3.1
1979	4,885	641	13.1	179	27.9	92	51.4	462	72.1	20	4.3
1980	5,377	643	12.0	191	29.7	88	46.1	452	70.3	21	4.6

Data Source: Longitudinal Master File SAS Analysis.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES
8118 MATH-SCIENCES BUILDING
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024
FE 36

MAR 2 1984